



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

\*Dominicellum—dameisel.

This word must be excluded, since the Folk-Latin form was *domnus*, *i* falling between *m-n*; the compound would naturally be built on the popular form. This explains the presence of the *e* in *dameisel*, the *mn* requiring a supporting vowel.

Pūtīditatem—puteé,<sup>30</sup> nitīditatem—neteeé,<sup>30</sup> \*arboriscellum—arbroissel, \*nidificare—nicher, \*planiturosum—plantureux,<sup>31</sup> \*auctoricare—ot-tieier.<sup>32</sup>

### 3. Words compounded with prepositions.

This list includes only those compounded forms which have not the simplex as an independent word in French. In every case the development indicates that the secondary accent was on the first syllable of the last member.

\*Allecticare—allecher, \*apprivitiare—apprivoiser, \*assēditare—assetter, \*attitulare(?)—atteler, \*delābulare—délābrer, \*exfundulare—effondrer, \*expandicare—épancher, \*expūliciare—épucer, \*expāventare—épaventer, \*extrādicare—esraichier, impēdicare—empêcher, intaminare—entamer, \*imprūmutuare—emprunter, interrogare—enterver, recuperare—recouvrer, reprobare—reprocher, ad mēnt(em) habere amentevōir.<sup>33</sup>

### 4. Words conforming to the accent law but furnishing only negative evidence, since they are explicable by analogy:

\*Aureleanensis—Orlénois, (cf. Orléans), \*Vigilantivus—Veillantif, (cf. veiller), \*expilūcare—éplucher (cf. expilūcat),<sup>34</sup> \*pediticūlare—pétiller (cf. pediticulat), \*movitinare—mutiner<sup>35</sup> (cf. movitinat), \*sollicitare—soucier (cf. sollicitat), jolatoreum—jogleor (cf. nom. joglere), predicatorum—prêcheur (cf. prêcher), semina-

<sup>30</sup> For the seeming exception to Darmesteter's Law, cf. Darnes., *l. c.*, p. 150.

<sup>31</sup> The *u* in this word presents a violation of Darmesteter's Law that indicates it is half-learned.

<sup>32</sup> This word seems to indicate that the second pretonic fell before the protonic. This last then remains as a supporting vowel. Mr. Darmesteter, *l. c.*, p. 153, explains the word from a third pers. sing. *auctoricat*, but there is no sufficient reason for the accent in this form to rest on the penult.

<sup>33</sup> Cited because the parts do not develop as if they were separate words.

<sup>34</sup> Where the *i*, being pretonic, falls.

<sup>35</sup> For the *u*, cf. *mutin*.

torem—semeur (cf. semer), medicamentum,—megement, \*medicaticium, megeis, \*medicatrissam,—megerisse (cf. meges).

### 5. Words that throw no light on the question, but offer no opposition to initial accentuation.

Cōnquīsitōnem—cuisençon, \*gravamentare—guermenter, \*invōlūtūare—enveloppeur, oripēlargum—orpres, aedificare—aigier, fructificare—frotigier, \*frigidulosum—frileux.

The last word, in spite of its irregularity, would point to initial accent were it not that we should write it \**frigidulosum* (cf. dominicellum, *supra*, col. 359, l. 1, and so it has only two pretonic syllables.

Our discussion thus far has included only words with three pretonic syllables. What of those that have more? I have found only five such words, and they are worthless as test words:

\*Apparicūlare—appareiller (cf. pareil), \*pediticūlare—pétiller (cf. 3rd person sing.), \*expediticūlare—épouiller (cf. 3rd person sing.), \*exaequacūlare—égailler (cf. 3rd person sing.), \*excollūbicare—escolorgier (cf. 3rd person sing.).

We have now completed the list of words that bear on the question and find that the law fits all cases arising under it. But, after all, its main feature, initial accent, was announced by Mr. Meyer-Lübke several years ago. Yet it is since then that Darmesteter's grammar, positing binary accent, appeared, and that Schwan, in the second edition of his grammar, reasserted his theory. In view of this, and especially as none of the evidence in the matter had been given, I have deemed this examination of the question justifiable. If it has confirmed one of the theories already announced, I am glad that such is the case rather than to add a new theory to the list already too large.

E. C. ARMSTRONG.

Johns Hopkins University.

## CONTEMPORARY FRENCH LITERATURE.

*Nouveaux essais de littérature contemporaine*, by GEORGES PELLISSIER. Paris: 1895. 18mo, 382 pp.

IN this second volume of essays Pellissier considers the work of Alfred de Vigny, the Younger Dumas, Taine, Zola, J. H. Rosny, Marcel Prévost, Abel Hermant, Paul Bourget, Paul Hervieu, Jules Lemaître, Loti and Anatole France. The scope of his treatment varies from a discussion of the author as represented in his entire writings (de Vigny, Dumas, Rosny, Hermant, France) to the review of his latest productions (Zola, Prévost, Bourget). De Vigny, whom we did not expect to find among contemporary authors, appears here on account of his alleged relations to the symbolist school, while Taine receives a passing mention in connection with his standards of literary criticism.

Of the genuine contemporaries Rosny, who supports the plots of his books with erudition furnished by the natural sciences, Prévost, who attained temporary notoriety by his argument against the "Americanizing" of French manners, or morals (*Demi-Vierges*), Hermant, whilom disciple of Zola, now in revolt and a psychologist, or anatomist of the mental attributes of man; and Hervieu, whose sketches of fashionable society have extended his reputation beyond local limits, are still to be classed among the second or even third-rate writers, and as such possess few attractions for foreigners. France and Lemaître may be more rightfully studied as critics; but it is in their capacity as novelists that they are reviewed here, Lemaître in his story *les Rois*—partly "philosophical" and partly idyllic, and interesting principally for the way it reflects the personality of its author—France, under the plea he himself presents, that "criticism is a kind of novel-writing, since every novel is an autobiography." Pellissier's remarks on this eclectic wit ("delicious sophist" he terms him) are among the keenest and most judicious of the collection. They form also one of its longest chapters.

There remain, after these deductions, four authors, the most prominent, the most widely read at home and abroad, Dumas  *fils*, Zola, Bourget and Loti. The first of these and the oldest in years, Dumas has recently published an essay on the status of the modern family, and this paper occasions Pellissier's study of Dumas' attitude towards the family in his dramas.

When Dumas first appealed to the suffrages of a Parisian audience, he had already made his choice of subject and decided on the tendency of his life-work. He had determined to bring before his nation in the most effective way, appealing both to the ear and eye, the unnatural pass to which the laws governing the relations of the family among its members had brought that nation, or rather the society of the nation. Since these laws deviated from the laws of nature, and were no longer based on the foundations of justice, he would devote all his energies to their modification, and to a warfare with the conventionalities which supported them. By obtaining their recasting, so that they should conform to the natural ties of man, he would thus redeem society and insure its perpetuity. Consequently, Dumas is not to be regarded as a revolutionary agitator, but as a prudent conservative. His first plays revealed his doctrine: Love which continued outside of wedlock was vain, contrary to the decrees of nature; nor could the courtesan, however deep her repentance and pure her affection, hope for an honorable union in this life, to the detriment of the family (*la Dame aux camélias*). The same reasoning under somewhat different circumstances—the woman being older, having been once married and seeking to fortify her new respectability with another marriage—obtains in *le Demi-Monde*.

Later, the other side of the question is brought forward, and the young girl who has erred through ignorance or deceit may redeem herself, and take her place among the matrons of the land (*les Idées de Mme Aubray, Denise*). Even the wife, who hides for the child's sake a sin antecedent to her marriage, may receive a full pardon from a just husband (*Monsieur Alphonse*). But the punishment of the adulterer of either sex is swift and sure (*la Femme de Claude, la Princesse Georges, l'Étrangère, Francillon*). Finally, the father's duty towards his illegitimate offspring is emphatically proclaimed (*le Fils naturel*).

Any one familiar with French social prejudices, with the laws governing the responsibilities of unmarried parents—where all the burdens are thrown upon the women—and with the traditions of the French drama (most

important of all in the present case), will understand what a task Dumas set for himself. Pellissier sees in this long struggle, lasting a whole generation, the desire of the dramatist to defend the interest of society:

"le seul intérêt qui le préoccupe, c'est l'intérêt supérieur de la société, et comme la société a pour base la famille, c'est au relèvement de l'esprit familial qu'il a partout et toujours travaillé" (p. 93).

But we are inclined to differ somewhat from our critic, and find back of this desire something more personal, more intimate. Dumas' own position as regards society, the mutual relations of his parents, the Bohemian circle outside of social barriers in which his youth was passed, the impression made upon his mind by the fate of Marie Duplessis (Marguerite Gautier), are not these the determining motives for his unrelenting assaults on human conventionalities, where they had grown away from nature? Another man in the same situation would very likely have become an enemy of society. But Dumas is a logician above everything, and also an observer. He could, being comfortable in material things (for very few nihilists are financially at ease), separate himself from his theme. Thus enabled to see both sides of the question, he can argue patiently for the modification of social statutes and opinions. Therefore, he is not a destroyer of the present social status, but a reformer of it. That he now thinks the family in a disintegrating state, and looks forward to its ultimate blending with humanity may, perhaps, be placed to the credit of socialistic theories, though I rather suspect it is mainly due to the changes wrought in French society by the invasion of Anglo-Saxon conceptions of family relations.

Dumas defends society as he would have it. Zola is indifferent to it, posing neither as its detractor nor advocate, but as a delineator of its latter-day passions. Pellissier, in dealing with this writer, considers only *la Débacle* and *le Docteur Pascal*. But since the latter had been heralded by the novelist as the crowning volume of his work, and in fact closed the long series of the Rougon-Macquart, it may very well be taken as an epitome of the whole. Pellissier naturally looks upon it in this light,

and welcomes the opportunity of discussing Zola's proposition underlying the series: the influence of heredity on the different members of the same family group. It is now nearly a quarter of a century since Zola formulated this law for his work, and though the ideas on which it was based have become somewhat trite, have reached the state of accepted beliefs and are assigned to their place in the general mass of human conceptions, yet the Rougon-Macquart family has continued to develop almost wholly along these novel (to 1870) lines. To be sure, Pellissier finds little trouble in tracing the influence of other opinions on the leading one. From the position of a passionless positivist that death is the end of existence, Zola has advanced to the state of an inquirer into the meaning of life, looking beyond the fact, dwelling on the mystery. Pascal is at times a disciple of occultism even.

Still the typical positivist, personified by this uncertain physician, overcomes the mystic, typified by his ward, by initiating her into the details of her family history—a conversion not at all plausible to the reader. It seems rather like begging the entire question. And it is possible that Zola himself is conscious of of his sleight-of-hand victory, for in *le Docteur Pascal* he brings forward more definitely and persistently than ever before his theory of the good, the moral good, attained by the mere continuity of physical life. Can it be that the supreme good of the Rougon-Macquart series is life? Life not in its living, but in its transmission, the mere succession of generations, son following on father? This is the lesson of *le Docteur Pascal*. By the transmission of life, the most decided positivist is made comparatively immortal, coexistent with the earth and the animals it breeds. And in this creation of new lives, this propagation of the species, virtue and vice are reconciled.

My attention was first drawn to this new conception of the novelist's by the concluding chapters of *Germinal*. The hope which there appears, the hope of the ultimate triumph of the right, through the progression of humanity, stood out in distinct colors when contrasted to the moral that sin is death of *l'Assommoir* and *Nana*. After *Germinal* the original doc-

trine was taken up again by *la Terre* and *la Bête humaine*. With *l'Argent*, however, the dogma of worldly immortality reappears, is transmitted to *la Débacle* and applied to the regeneration of a people, and, finally, is expanded into a Zolaesque code of ethics in *le Docteur Pascal*. It is the great man of the family, who would naturally affirm most strongly the first idea of the series, that qualifies it and undermines it with this phantom of a continued life beyond the grave, but on the earth: an earthly life the result of earthly affection.

This position is not positivism, as we understand it, yet it cannot be considered as in itself alien to Zola's belief in heredity. His preface to *la Fortune des Rougon* dated July 1st, 1871 is his manifesto:

"Je veux expliquer comment une famille . . . se comporte dans une société en s'épanouissant . . . Je tâcherai de trouver et de suivre, en résolvant la double question des tempéraments et des milieux, le fil qui conduit mathématiquement d'un homme à un autre homme . . ."

The last creation is, however, to be an exception to the rule, and Pascal is to study his family traits, as though he were not of it. The source of Zola's inspiration is evident. He is a true disciple of Taine. He desired, like his master, to apply to man the undeviating rules of nature, "mathématiquement" as he says. And he adhered to this, in the main, most uncompromisingly. Even after *Germinal*, in *l'Œuvre*, where the opportunity to anticipate the leading principle of *le Docteur Pascal* presented itself, he resisted the temptation, and closed the volume with "allons travailler," as the panacea for right and wrong.

More recently he broadens his view. The legacy of life is essential to the fact of heredity. Therefore the transmission of life is the chief duty of man—provided he allows the desirability of continued human existence—and also the ethics of the Rougon-Macquart, just as the law of temperaments and environment was its psychology. The bearing of this doctrine on practical morality is direct, and the consequence somewhat startling. For it would place the vicious and the virtuous on the same plane, and would justify them both by their success in propagating their kind. Thus con-

duct and character are effectually removed from the field of moral science. Still, we must endeavor to read between the lines in this matter, and release our novelist from the strict application of his doctrine. For it is quite possible that he really intends to uphold the evolutionist theory of evil, and look for the gradual disappearance of wrong, worn away by the continuation of life through countless generations.

But, as the facts stand, Zola is guilty in his crowning volume of a persistent self-contradiction. He chooses to consider men as animals merely—indeed the dumb beast is our elder brother—and allows no difference between man and the other forms of animal life. In other words, he neglects the peculiarities of the species, its sympathies, prejudices, manners, ideals. He sets his best man and best woman in the midst of an organized society, and makes them live like isolated savages on a desert island. They violate the principle of the family, as Dumas would claim, and in neglecting the formal observance of human customs (or the requirements of nature herself?) they are ostracised, ruined, starved out. And all this, not for the sake of principle, because they believe marriage is contrary to the interest of mankind, but from indolence, neglect, "innocence," perhaps Zola would say. It is this stripping man of the usual, ordinary attributes of the species that leads some to condemn Zola's whole program as the reverse of "natural" and "scientific." He takes a general law of nature, and applies it without reservations or modifications to the most exceptional, independent type known in nature. But is there anything in the world pure, unmodified? Light even comes to us through a medium.

From Zola to Bourget is not a long step. Both are naturalists, followers of Taine, positivists. Only Bourget is a mental naturalist usually, while Zola is generally a physical one. One of Bourget's recent books (*Cosmopolis*) rather approaches Zola's standpoint of view, and analyzes the influence of heredity on personages that are typical each of its nation. It is a refined, international *Pot Bouille*—with all deference to Bourget.

Still with the greater number of Bourget's

characters the study of individual emotions and experiences predominates. The dissection of the minds of his heroes and heroines is his chief occupation; and the motives which actuate them the object of his researches. In the earlier novels this was the end of the story. But the later ones are yielding to the new tendency of converting their sinners, and do not close until they are safely within the fold of the church. One of the books that Pellissier reviews (*Terre promise*) is slightly more complicated, and chooses for its plot one of Dumas' favorite problems—the claims of the natural child on its father.

The question, which naturally arises in regard to Bourget's new view, is how deep this religious sentiment goes, how fruitful from the spiritual standpoint are these conversions. All the evidence at hand would indicate a literary fad, rather than a heart-felt longing. The persual of Bourget's novels tends not to edification. He puts before us a picture of sin, analyzing the desires and thoughts of his characters, who are actuated mainly by sensual emotions. When these emotions are exhausted, when the sinners are thoroughly disillusioned with the world and bored with life, then the novelist varies their monotony by opening to them the portals of the church. That the sinners are comparatively youthful when converted is no merit at all, since they have lived fast and run through all the physical sensations possible.

Pellissier sees in this twofold direction of Bourget's more recent stories the working of a tender heart upon a scientific mind. Possibly there may also be in it the echo of the humanitarianism which was proclaimed by the Russian novelists, or even the inevitable reaction against the creeds of positivism and naturalism. And possibly also it may come from Bourget himself, and represent a genuine belief on his part in the efficacy of righteousness and faith. *Le Crime d'amour* proclaimed the redemption of sinners through pity, while *le Disciple* showed a convert by reason. It may be that a future volume (*Terre promise* contains one original, unstained believer) will take up this question of man's relations to his fellowmen and his Creator, and by the process of analysis disclose to us the workings of a

pure and upright soul, bent on the evangelization of the family and society. A champion of the Church militant would not be an unwelcome character in a psychological novel.

Bourget is an observer, a student of man outside of himself. Loti is also an observer, but an observer who is mainly concerned with his own emotions. Like Bourget and Zola he is a naturalist in his methods. Unlike them he shares in the sentiments he portrays, lives the life of his characters, breathes into them, whatever their condition and station, his own aspirations and his own terrors. For Loti knows the meaning of terror—this is the theme of Pellissier's review—and that terror is the one ever present with humanity, the terror of death. It is, perhaps, this overwhelming sense of the transitoriness of all things which makes Loti the writer that he is, indeed makes him a writer at all, as Pellissier would claim. For besides his marvelous aptitude for reflecting the outside world, the lines and hues of nature and art, to a degree of accuracy which can hardly be surpassed by the devices of photographic art itself, he has the faculty of casting around these reproductions of facts a shade of melancholy, of retrospect and foreboding, which never fails to react on the pulse of his reader, however common and ordinary reason and science may deem the theme. I only wonder that Loti has not been enrolled by force among the symbolists, so great is the twofold impression of fact and yearning that his words create.

What is the burden of this sceptic's song? The truism that we die while living, that every fleeting moment bears something of ourselves away, and every departure of friend or acquaintance, every removal of abode, destroys a certain portion of our personality. This we all know and accept more or less consciously, looking forward to a life beyond, eternally complete. Not so with Loti. He knows, believes nothing beyond the grave. For him death is oblivion, the vital spirit a part of the ambient air into which it vanishes. From such a destiny he shrinks—for he is no stoic—with sickening dread. It would be less painful to him to allow a compromise, to favor the fancies of occultism or take refuge in the survival of the species, trusting to the laws of

heredity for some slight existence through the coming generations. But he rejects all these comforts. He refuses to believe what he cannot see. The passing moments, the seasons gliding by, the day life of summer insects, the longer existence of the larger animals, all remind him that his end comes soon (*le Livre de la Pitié et de la Mort*). For they all are a part of him through his contact with them.

To save what he can of himself from destruction (Pellissier's argument), Loti turns in desperation to literature. And what he consigns of himself to the more enduring substance of books he considers, at least for a time, as rescued from annihilation. Here is the key to Loti's writings. They are autobiographies, in fact if not in name, descriptions of the different phases of the author's career, the places he has visited, the people he has met, the joys and sorrows he has occasioned or shared. Even his dreams are not disregarded in this category of emotions. Through all the changes of such a varied existence, tinged all these pictures of phenomena and art, runs the stream of his great, absorbing pity, pity for the brute beasts which die under his eyes, pity for Sylvestre and Gaud and Aziyadé, pity for springtime and autumn, pity above all for himself. He pities humanity, he suffers at the thought of humanity's earthly goal, but he pities and suffers obstinately, refusing succor. He adheres to facts. He imparts to facts symbols for this life. He denies to them symbols for a life beyond. By this constancy to his belief in the annihilation of the soul, in the similarity of man and beast, Loti remains today almost the only prominent defender of positivism and naturalism in literature. Even Dumas, who in the successive plays of his theatre did not swerve from the formula he had adopted at the outset, has doubts of his future state, and admits, indeed hopes, that some day he may be restored to that father, from whom it has been his lasting regret that he was separated ("Epître" at the head of *les Trois Mousquetaires*).

It would be rather difficult to draw a general moral from this new collection of Pellissier's, or even to conjecture from a study of these four leading writers what tendencies are to characterize the literature of the immediate

future. They all belong to the past. Their inspiration came from that wave of scientific investigation and deduction which submerged Europe during the reign of the Third Napoleon. That wave—so much their writings and indecisions teach—has now spent its force. It will apparently bear no other author to honor and renown, and as yet it has had no follower. The fluctuations of the later writers, Rosny, Hermant, Lemaître, France (to cite only from Pellissier), their seekings for something new, or their eclecticism and opportunism, amply prove that no new ideas have come to arouse the sleeping forces of literature. When the ideas do come there will be no seeking, no hesitations, no quackery. Fads will have had their day. And poets will sing, dramatists plan, novelists portray as the consensus of human opinion compels them.

F. M. WARREN.

*Adelbert College.*

#### OLD FRENCH TEXTS.

*L'Espurgatoire Seint Patriz* of Marie de France. An Old-French Poem of the twelfth century, published with an Introduction and a Study of the language of the author. Dissertation presented to the Board of University Studies of the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, by THOMAS ATKINSON JENKINS. Philadelphia: Press of Alfred J. Ferris, 1894. 8vo, pp. vi, 151.

WITH comparative rapidity the little band of widely scattered students of Romance philology in America are coming to cherish a feeling of *esprit de corps*, are beginning to recognize that there exists in this country something of a fellowship of kindred minds into which may be welcomed with cordiality younger aspirants for the honors and (can we say?) emoluments of a department of University activity peculiarly remote from the practical applications of daily life. Into such a fellowship, by the present well-chosen, well-conceived, and well-executed piece of work, Dr. Jenkins (who will not resent being classed among the younger scholars, since his "Vita" informs us that he was born in 1868) has shown good and sufficient reason to be welcomed. Nor is the free-